

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 and 23-25 are cancelled. Applicant does not concede these claims are not patentable. Applicant is merely selecting a particular claim type to facilitate prosecution and reserves the right to prosecute the cancelled claims in one or more continuation applications.

Claim 22 is amended above to require the competency lens to include four specific recited strategies. Support is found in Applicant's specification page 9, line 27 to page 10, line 1.

Claim 22 is also amended to require the collaborations to include patterns to be applied to the selected components to model how the selected components collaborate. Support is found on page 10, lines 11-16.

Applicant respectfully requests entry of these amendments to claim 22. No new matter is entered.

Claim 22 is the sole remaining claim in the present application. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 is therefore moot.

Claim 22, however, stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Northcott (U.S. 2003/0167198) in view of Lindsay-Scott (U.S. 2004/0117234). As amended above, claim 22 is now allowable over these cited documents for the following reasons.

Northcott describes in the cited paragraph [0008] a map of tasks. Applicant claims a map of components. Applicant claims filtering the map of components to form a two dimensional heat map of selected components. A heat map is defined in applicant's specification page 9, lines 14-15, as a component map having only the selected components. Northcott does not describe this filtering step. Northcott describes selecting a potential target task and mapping this potential target task into a network of one or more sub-tasks. The sub-tasks are obviously not tasks from his original map of tasks. In fact, Northcott describes selecting only a single target task. He does not describe selecting a plurality of target tasks and therefore does not map a plurality of target tasks into a heat map of selected components as required by Applicant's claim 22.

Claim 22 has been amended above to require the competency lens to include offerings of business strategy, information technology strategy, organizational strategy, and operations strategy. The Examiner states that Northcott implicitly discloses mapping based on a competency lens. However, as amended above, Northcott does not describe or suggest implicitly or otherwise a competency lens having offerings of these four strategies now required by claim 22.

Claim 22 has also been amended above to require the collaborations to include patterns to be applied to the selected components to model how the selected components collaborate. The Examiner correctly states that Northcott does not describe this. As amended above, neither does Lindsay-Scott describe this.

In paragraph [0029] Lindsay-Scott describes collaboration between organizational groups within an organization, but does not describe or suggest applying patterns to selected components to model how the components collaborate as now required by claim 22.

Claim 22 is therefore allowable over the combination of Northcott and Lindsay-Scott for each of the reasons given above. Applicants respectfully request such allowance.

The Application is deemed in condition for allowance and such action by the Examiner is urged. Should differences remain, however, which do not place one/more of the remaining claims in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned at the number provided below for the purpose of providing constructive assistance and suggestions in accordance with M.P.E.P. Sections 707, 707.07(d) and 707.07(j) in order that allowable claims can be presented, thereby placing the application in condition for allowance without further proceedings being necessary.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 09/30/2008

By: /John R. Pivnichny/

John R. Pivnichny

Reg. No. 43,001

Telephone: (607)429-4358

Fax: (607)429-4119